

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000100760001-2

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000100760001-2

Some Problems in the International Communist Movement

One of the factors which hinders a policy of determined attack upon imperialism is the division within the world revolutionary and communist movement. First of all, the conflicts between the USSR and China.

Matters in this regard have deteriorated in the past year.

Currently China and the USSR are confronting each other more bitterly and harshly than they are confronting Yankee imperialists. Generally speaking, they have better relations with the capitalist governments than they have between themselves.

China has passed from ultraleftist verbalism to a "realism" in foreign policy which has led it to reach understandings and improve its relations with a series of governments, including some of the most reactionary. It is relying on this method to offset the policy of encirclement and military pressure which the USSR in turn is pursuing with regard to China. The Soviet obsession with the challenge of China leads it to such extremes even as maintaining diplomatic relations with the Yankee puppet Lon Nol, and not recognizing the government of Sihanouk. At the meeting which was held in Brussels in May by the Committee of the Assembly of Public Opinion on European Security, the delegations from various socialist countries (the USSR, German Democratic Republic, and others) proposed that China be condemned as the main enemy of peace in Europe (while there was not even any criticism of Yankee imperialism). This foolish action was prevented by a resounding negative from the representatives of the Communist Parties of Italy, France, Belgium, and Spain. During the course of these discussions, which were private, one could sense something which seemed to me incredible: a stubborn insistence on naming China as the number one enemy, and to give an anti-Chinese aspect to the European security policy.

This aggravation of the Chinese-Russian conflict allows the Yankee imperialists to maneuver to make the conflict between the two main socialist powers more bitter on both sides. This advantage to the imperialists is noted even by individuals with the least possible political background. However, there has been no evidence either from the Soviet or the Chinese side of any kind of initiative to attempt to break this vicious circle, to change the trend, at least to reduce the tension, to pave the way toward the improvement of matters.

The serious thing, apart from the conflict as such, is the total lack of attempts, of efforts to find new channels, new solutions. To invent a proper way, as Marxists within socialism, to deal with the upsurge of a very serious conflict between two states which have brought about the socialist revolution.

Instead of this, the conflict is developing along the most typical channels of the old kind of politics, and so we see how they are seeking support even from the imperialist nations. Given this reality, which should not be denied, we wonder what revolutionary consideration explains that things should proceed thus? Is it of interest perhaps to the workers class in China or that in the USSR? Not at all. Is the Chinese or the Soviet revolution perhaps benefited, not to seek a world revolution? Simply asking the question gives the answer. In fact, it is a conflict between two great powers, two states which oppose each other as such.

The root of this sad reality lies without a doubt in the predominant role which the state plays today in the socialist countries (at least the more powerful ones), to the detriment of the party's own role, as the party: in other words, as a vanguard of the workers class, of the masses, as the conscious vanguard of historical progress, as the motive force of the process which should lead to the transition to communism, to the world socialist revolution. The theoretical aspects have been taken up in the report by Comrade Santiago Carrillo on the draft program. In the conflict between the USSR and China, this problem presents itself in acute form to all communists, all revolutionaries. Via paths which have been very different, and by means of forms which are also very different today, we nonetheless find ourselves faced with this problem of diffusion of the party and the state as the tool of power. This distortion of the essence of socialism, with the limitation or elimination of socialist democracy (at least with regard to the basic political questions, which are resolved by a small nucleus of leaders) is the reason that the role and the weight of the workers class, of the masses, is reduced and narrowed, being limited to secondary areas. The state on the other hand, with all that every state (even if it is socialist) has of presocialist aspect, of capitalist vestiges (as Lenin explained with full clarity) is predominating and imposing itself. To a process of bureaucratization internally, is added regression in revolutionary attitudes, externally. Events such as the recent election of the comrades who head the diplomatic, army, and security services to the Political Bureau of the CPSU seem good examples to me. How worrisome the trend to exalt the role of a single individual as a party or state leader is.

Within this framework, there emerge in the foreign policies of the great socialist powers aspects, and they are not secondary ones, with which we are not in agreement, because we believe that they are inconsistent with the demands of the revolutionary struggle. We reiterate our total support of the efforts of the USSR to guarantee peace and coexistence. We understand the extraordinary value of the conversations of Comrade Brezhnev with Nixon to this end. We also understand why the USSR and other socialist countries seek to reach agreements on commercial and economic cooperation, etc., with capitalist countries, in order to raise the standard of living of their peoples, to accelerate their development, etc.

The point of disagreement does not lie here. It arises when, in the implementation of this policy, there is de facto acceptance of the prospects for a political and social status quo in the world, as if this were the natural consequence of peaceful coexistence, while in our view, and this was set forth by the 1969 Conference, they are two completely different things.

In the third point of the principles for USSR-U.S. relations signed by Brezhnev and Nixon in May of 1972 in Moscow, it says that the two countries "should do everything in their power to prevent the development of conflicts or situations which will aggravate international tensions," a point which represents a serious step, in our view, toward a policy of political and social "status quo."

In a study on predictions for the future drafted by Comrade Inosentsev, a leading figure in the Soviet delegation to the 1969 Conference (the study was presented as an address in Varna in October 1972), three hypotheses for the development of western Europe in the coming period were set forth. But none of them included the possibility of some change of a socialist nature, or even the end of fascism in any European country, and this when the study was concerned particularly with the Mediterranean, the area in which the greatest tensions in the future years are expected to be focused. In other words, there are three possibilities, with greater or lesser expansion of relations with the east contemplated, but within a capitalist system as stable in the west as socialism is in the east.

In connection with the recent visit of Comrade Brezhnev to the United States, we had the opportunity of reading an article by a Soviet journalist, Melor Stouroua, of the Novosti Agency in the Paris newspaper Le Monde for 19 June 1973. Some quotations from it are worth noting. "Attracted by these prospects, the large American businesses such as General Electric, International Business Machines, General Motors, etc., are signing

contracts with the Soviet organization. The financial giants of the United States, such as Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank, the Bank of America, and the U.S. Export-Import Bank are establishing branches in Moscow. These gentlemen from Chase Manhattan are proud of having offices in Moscow at the following address -- No 1 Karl Marx Square. Is this not symbolic?

"Here, too, we see the transition from quantitative changes to qualitative ones. In the addresses he delivered during his visit to the German Federal Republic, Leonid Brezhnev spoke of the prospects for economic cooperation between the socialist countries and the capitalist countries over some decades. Some of my colleagues in the west think of replacing the "system of nuclear hostages" with a system of economic hostages. I dislike the expression "system of hostages." It is in bad taste. But the idea as such is good."

This article sets forth the basically anti-socialist thesis, suggesting that on a given level, the economic agreements with the USSR are a guarantee, "with hostages," against socialism, for the big fish in the capitalist world. The serious thing is that this can be said using quotations from leaders of the CPSU. However naive we might be, we cannot attribute such a text to the enthusiasm or originality of the journalist.

With attitudes of this sort, wherein revolution disappears from the horizon in the foreign policy of the major socialist countries, along with the other factors to which we have referred, we arrive at the following contradictions: faced with the ever more obvious crisis in imperialism, the communist parties which are in power in the most powerful countries are adopting defensive attitudes in contrast with the requirements of the anti-imperialist battle. Thus we are surprised to see that Soviet and Chinese journalists keep silent about a case like Watergate, that cancer of the Nixon team which reveals all of the putrefaction of the Yankee imperialism.

When the main leaders in these countries speak of international problems, they do so generally only as statesmen. They do not express any combative vanguard thinking about the world struggle against imperialism. Theirs are ideas and words almost always subjugated to diplomatic considerations, and thus they do not reach the revolutionaries. There is an enormous chasm between the potential of the material media and the potential of revolutionary thinking.

Although I have thus far stressed a series of negative aspects, which we cannot overlook, it would be one sided and absurd to believe that this is the basic thing. Impressive advances have been made in the world revolutionary movement

(and I said this at the beginning), and without a doubt others are coming to fruition. The progress in detente represents a basic factor in changing the situation to the benefit of the anti-imperialist forces. Thus more favorable conditions for unity among and an offensive by the anti-imperialist forces are being created. And it is because the real framework today is thus that the negative factors mentioned are so regrettable.

The PCE continues to support, perhaps even more today than yesterday, a stubborn and tireless struggle for unity of action on the part of all the communist and workers parties. To achieve this it is necessary to utilize all situations which may emerge from unity, the unity of all, even though they be very limited to begin with. And at the same time we must avoid everything which can be reflected in a crystallization of division, in inflaming tensions.

In this connection, we want to note here, giving them our fullest support, the words spoken by Comrade Le Duan, secretary general of the Workers Party in Vietnam, during his trip to a number of socialist countries, in favor "of closer solidarity among the brotherly socialist countries and within the international communist movement, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and in a fashion consistent with reason and judgement."

It is true that the horizon seems dark today. But we are persuaded that in the longer run, the revolutionary changes which have already come about, with the elimination of the exploiter classes, are creating a foundation such that what unites the socialist countries will be greater than what separates them. What separates them is rooted in yesterday. What unites them, what will unite them, belongs to tomorrow. And in one way or another, although not automatically, the anti-imperialist and socialist changes in other parts of the world will contribute too.

We will continue to make our modest contribution in every way that we can to the struggle to overcome conflicts and advance toward unity, against imperialism, among all the communist parties.

It is necessary to work with enthusiasm, with tenacity, in order to achieve a world front of all the anti-imperialist forces.

At the same time, we believe it essential to promote the most serious debates possible among comrades within Marxism concerning the problems of our movement, without concealing our critical views, and in particular discussion of the negative

phenomena which have emerged in the historic shaping of our theory, and which must be studied in order to overcome them. This is of interest not only to one specific party but to all the parties.

It is clear, therefore, that the PCE is in favor of meetings and discussions, of gatherings and conferences, on principle. We favor everything which may encourage more collective debates and discussions, in the search for joint action. We believe that a certain "decentralization" of the unity process is needed today, in other words bilateral gatherings, meetings of parties which have common problems and more similar situations. But our continuing concern is to contribute to the unity of all the parties, of the movement as a whole.

We should mention a proposal which if indeed it is not of a formal nature, is beginning to be discussed. This is the proposal that a new international conference of communist and workers parties be held. An article by Comrade Telalov, secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party, urging such a conference, has been published in the Revista Internacional. On the other hand, Comrade A. Kotlov has published an article in the Soviet periodical Political Self-education which in rather direct form urges such a conference.

How is the concept of a new conference of this sort justified? The new thing (in comparison to that held in 1969, which was focused on the idea of unity of action among the parties) is that now there is an insistence on ideological cohesion. Now then, cohesion about what? If we read the articles by Comrades Telalov and Kotlov, if we study some of the recent documents or texts of the parties in the socialist countries, we see an unmistakeable desire to return to the positions which were explicitly or implicitly placed in the past in 1969.

For example, the idea that "the touchstone of internationalism is the attitude toward the CPSU," or the concept to the effect that the CPSU plays "vanguard role" in our movement are being increasingly repeated, even in official communiques such as that signed by Comrades Brezhnev and Honecker in Berlin.

At the same time, the intention to condemn the Communist Party of China emerges with growing clarity. Comrades Telalov and Kotlov, in more or less the same terms, demand cooperation among the parties in the struggle against the Chinese Communist Party.

To believe that the path toward overcoming division is urging the parties to pursue a systematic campaign against China is a completely distorted view of reality. It means trying to

utilize the communist movement to promote a conflict between states. This leads not to unity but to more acute division.

It is one thing to criticize the Chinese comrades when one disagrees with something they do. Naturally, there is justification for this. And we have condemned their conduct in their relations with Franco. But it would be something very different to plunge into a campaign of anathema against the Chinese Communist Party. The PCE (and we know that many other parties think the same) refuse and will continue to refuse to embark on any such anti-Chinese campaign. Unfortunately, the negative phenomenon we see in the policy of the Communist Party of China, above all, in its international activities, are not isolated or unusual examples. We see them in other cases with perhaps less historical justification.

A conference to rally a series of parties around the CPSU and to condemn the Chinese Communist Party would make no contribution to unity. Quite the contrary. In 1969 (this was one of the most positive aspects of this conference) the independence and equality of the parties was stressed. It was specifically stated that there is no "leading center." And in practice, the right of the parties to have their own positions, differing from that of the CPSU, on such important questions as intervention in Czechoslovakia and attitude toward the Chinese Communist Party, was accepted.

A conference held now would tend to cancel out these positive advances made in 1969, as Comrade Telalov very clearly explained. He accuses the parties which insisted on their independence of "nationalism." He says that unity should be "organic" as well as political and ideological. And that it is necessary "for the policy of the parties to be drafted and coordinated collectively." This means returning to a "center." But under what conditions? It is frivolous to think that the parties in power today will "collectively draft" their policy with other parties. This is unrealistic. In fact, it is a way of urging (and the article as a whole confirms this) a return to the practices of unconditional endorsement of the CPSU.

Under these conditions, to set about preparing for a new conference now, far from contributing to creating an atmosphere of unity, would be to cause differences and divisions to arise and to inflame them.

Having said, we reassert our position in favor of international conferences in principle. We see how the idea of unity in diversity, essential today, is advancing. What is growing and developing, above all, there where the struggle is being waged, is not unconditional endorsement. It is the trend toward

independence for the parties, and true internationalism. An example such as the Workers Party of Vietnam has extraordinary value and weight in this connection. We are certain that in the more or less long run, favorable conditions will be created for holding a conference which will represent a step toward unity. We will support it with enthusiasm.

We regard the charge of "nationalist narrowness" made against those of our parties which insist on "independence" as entirely unjust. This insistence is dictated precisely by our desire to struggle with greater efficiency today for the unity among the parties and all the anti-imperialist forces. This insistence is dictated by our internationalist concern, in view of the realities in a world which, as it is now, is not as we would wish it to be. We have the specific experience of aggression of which we have been the victim, and from which we continue to suffer, thanks to the manipulations of Lister and Eduardo Garcia (now divided, but continuing to receive aid for the purpose of attacking us) and other groups. And it is indicative, and not a happenstance, that at the same time as this new faction has come to the fore now in Valencia and Madrid, openly taking an anti-Soviet stance, at the same time it is proposing unity to Lister's group, to that of Eduardo Garcia and so-called "pro-Chinese," etc., for the purpose of uniting more forces in order to struggle against the PCE. Experience shows that the choice today is as follows:

Either an independent party such as ours is (which for this very reason can become the effective leader of the revolution in its own country, and can then be truly internationalist; or

A series of little parties condemned to be manipulated by external pressures, as a function among other things of the conflicts between socialist states, doomed to be a fertile field for all kinds of degeneration, and useless for the purposes of the revolution.

We must see the somewhat contradictory conditions under which the forms of proletarian internationalism present themselves today. On the one hand, we have a basic objective need to raise internationalism to a higher level, as a function of historic changes themselves. The international nature of the workers class is today clearer and stronger than in the past. The phenomenon of multinational enterprises is strengthening it still further. The interrelation among the various struggles in the various countries against imperialism stands out clearer than ever. The example of the movement of solidarity with Vietnam is eloquent.

But in the current stage, with 14 socialist nations and an acute conflict among them, the forms of internationalism must keep their distance with regard to the problems of state.

They must keep this distance not with a view to rupture, but precisely the contrary, in order to avoid a break. So that the Communist Party, the communist movement, can play a role in the direction of overcoming division and contributing to the unity of all of the socialist and anti-imperialist forces on a world scale.

Without a doubt, a temporary situation is involved. When socialism reaches a higher level in its historical maturing, when there is greater distance and more radical separation from the capitalist vestiges which still weight it down, internationalism will be able to take on much higher forms which are today impossible.

As to the advance of internationalism, on key questions and points in the battle against imperialism and capitalism we can today set forth achievements and prospects which are very positive and far reaching.

We recall how forcefully Comrade Santiago Carrillo urged, in his report to our Central Committee in September of 1970, the need to establish closer relations with the Communist Parties of Western Europe in order "to coordinate the class struggle on a European scale in all those aspects imposed upon us by reality today." He urged establishing contacts among the communist parties, the socialist parties, trade unions, Christian and Catholic and other groups, with a view to common action on a continental scale.

"If there were no other reasons," Carrillo said in 1970, "the very trend of the European monopolies and the concrete steps they have taken would reveal to the working masses of Europe, and first of all to the communist parties, the need to draft a common strategy with regard to the situation created for us by European capitalist development." "It is a matter of opposing the intentions of the monopolies and giving consistency to the prospects for a democratic and socialist Europe."

We have worked in this direction with intensity, first of all in our relations with the Communist Parties of Europe. At the same time we have established contacts with various socialist parties, contacts which we believe have contributed to the more combative attitude adopted against the Franco regime today by the Social Democrats of Europe. On various levels, we have held talks with the Socialist Parties of Great Britain, France, Italy, Sweden, Belgium, etc.

Parallel with this, similar concepts have matured within the most influential Communist Parties of Western Europe. We want to stress the first level importance of the Marchais-Berlinguer interview and the communique of the Communist Parties of Italy and France, followed in recent months by a series of other communiques issued by European parties which agree on the need for closer collaboration. We are entering into a new stage in the communist movement of western Europe, with the specific prospect of articulated actions on the part of the Communist Parties concerning key problems. These include, for example:

Struggle against the fascist regimes, and at the same time against authoritarian tendencies and against neofascism, and for the defense and development of democracy.

Coordination of the class struggle against the multinational monopolies, and defense of immigrant workers.

Struggle for a system of European security, against the foreign military bases, for disarmament and the elimination of blocs.

Struggle against colonialism and neocolonialism, and solidarity with the anti-imperialist struggles (Indochina, Cuba, Korea, Chile, Arab peoples, etc.)

Concerning these problems and others further possibilities for unity are also arising with the socialist parties and their youth groups, with vast Christian forces and with the trade union movement.

The establishment of the new European trade union center (although the reformists predominate therein today) represents an important step which may work to the benefit of the process of unity. It is our view that the revolutionary trade union movement of western Europe, by joining this center, will find a possibility for united struggle by the workers much superior to the potential existing today. Without a doubt this will create problems. But it is necessary to resolve them with the united struggle firmly in mind. It will be necessary to take stand on this matter. One basic task of the Communist Parties of western Europe is the joint drafting of a "standard image" of what socialism can and should be in this part of the world. Our greatest contribution to this task will be the draft program. Thus I will not go into this subject. I will merely stress that if this image of socialism adapted to our western European societies is jointly set forth by the Communist Parties of capitalist Europe, this gives us and will give us much greater strength.

It goes without saying that a clearer expression by the parties in the capitalist countries, far from being a hindrance, will make it possible to make a more effective contribution to the unity of the whole of the movement, which continues to be a basic goal. First of all, with a view to strengthening relations with the parties in the socialist countries, and similarly, with the non-European parties, but those with very similar problems (and I am thinking above all of the Communist Parties of Japan, Australia, Canada, and the United States).

One basic concern is to encourage solidarity, the internationalist unity of the European proletariat with the national liberation movements, with the struggles of the peoples of Asia, Latin America, and Africa, specifically the Arab peoples (particularly the people of Palestine) who continue to be the victims of the aggressive criminal policy of the leaders of Israel, supported by the United States.

We as a party are faced with the need for a more determined struggle against the colonial policy of the Franco regime in Africa. Our stands are very clear. We must recognize in self-critical fashion that we are not doing enough to promulgate them. The interview we had with the Moroccan Party of Liberation and Socialism represented a positive step in this sector.

It is obvious, then, that the more dynamic stage on which we are embarking where relations among the Communist Parties of Western Europe are concerned, in accordance with the requirements of the class struggle in this part of the world, will make a contribution to the unity of the whole of the communist movement and all of the anti-imperialist forces.

IV. A Foreign Policy for the Spanish Opposition

In this final portion, I shall discuss the crisis in the foreign policy of the Franco regime, and the situation, to some extent new, being created in terms of a much more offensive oriented policy and activity on the part of the opposition forces in the international field.

Commentaries on the recent change in government have stressed the chain of accumulating failures, above all, in the most recent period, in the foreign policy of the Franco regime. In this realm, the need for a change, even from the point of view of the interests of the capitalist class, is making itself urgently felt.

The world today is experiencing (and this is recognized by all, even from different and opposing angles) a profound change in the system of international relations. Bipolarity, based on

REVISTA BOLETA

revista teórica y política del partido comunista de Chile

¡SOLIDARIDAD CON LOS OBREROS Y DEMOCRATAS CHILENOS!

ALLENDE :

su pensamiento, su
sacrificio,
serán estímulo
para todos los
revolucionarios



Número 72

Cuarto trimestre 1973

SUMARIO

Comité de
RedacciónDirector:
S. Carrillo

★

Redactor-jefe:
Jesús Izcaray

★

Santiago Alvarez
Juan Diz
Ignacio Gallego
Juan Gómez
A. Elvira
Federico Melchor
E. Martí
Jaime Encinas
Nuria PlaNº 72
Madrid
Cuarto trimestre
1973Tras la experiencia chilena, **Santiago Carrillo** 3Llamamiento del P.C.E.: ¡Solidaridad con los obreros
y demócratas chilenos! 9Comunicado sobre la reunión del Pleno del C.C. del
Partido Comunista de España 11Sobre la Política Internacional del Partido. Informe
de **M. Azcárate** ante el C.C. 15El campo español y el Pacto para la libertad. Inter-
vención de **S. Alvarez** en el Pleno 31

La huelga general de junio en Navarra 43

La gran batalla obrera de la Ría bilbaína. **Koldo**
Etxeberri 55El Partido y la revolución (Respuesta a un camarada)
Wenceslao Roces 71

Resolución política del II Congreso del P.C. de Galicia 83

LIBROS

«Yo creo en la esperanza» de Díez-Alegría 91

Para toda correspondencia, dirigirse a:
M. Albert Coninck, 37, Jan Verbertlef - Edegem - Bélgica

III.

ALGUNOS PROBLEMAS DEL MOVIMIENTO COMUNISTA INTERNACIONAL

Uno de los factores que frena una política de ofensiva resuelta contra el imperialismo, es la división dentro del movimiento revolucionario y comunista mundial. En primer término, el conflicto entre la URSS y China.

Las cosas, en ese orden, han empeorado en el último año.

En la actualidad China y la URSS se enfrentan de forma más enconada, más dura, entre sí que contra el imperialismo yanqui. Tienen, por lo general, mejores relaciones con los gobiernos capitalistas, que no entre ellas.

China ha pasado de un verbalismo ultrazquierdista a un «realismo» en política exterior que la lleva a entenderse, a mejorar sus relaciones con una serie de gobiernos, incluso los más reaccionarios; confía en ese método para contrarrestar la política de cerco, de presión militar que, a su vez, realiza la URSS con respecto a China. La obsesión de la URSS por oponerse a China le lleva a extremos como el de mantener aún relaciones diplomáticas con el pelele yanqui Lon Nol y no reconocer al gobierno de Shianuk. En la reunión que se celebró en mayo en Bruselas, del Comité de la Asamblea de la opinión pública por la seguridad europea, las delegaciones de varios países socialistas (URSS, RDA y otras) propusieron que se condenase a China como principal enemigo de la paz en Europa (mientras no se criticaba siquiera al imperialismo yanqui). Semejante desatino fue evitado por una negativa rotunda de los representantes de los partidos comunistas de Italia, Francia, Bélgica y España. En el curso de esas discusiones —que eran privadas— pude palpar algo que me parecía increíble: la obstinación por colocar a China como enemigo número uno; y por dar a la política de seguridad europea un signo antichino.

Tal agravación del enfrentamiento China-URSS permite al imperialismo yanqui maniobrar, enconando de uno y otro lado el conflicto entre las dos principales potencias socialistas. Este beneficio para el imperialismo lo constatan hasta las personas con menos formación política. Sin embargo, no aparece, ni de parte soviética ni china, ningún tipo de iniciativa para intentar salir del círculo vicioso, cambiar la corriente, rebajar al menos la tensión, abrir un camino que mejore las cosas.

Lo grave, además del conflicto en sí, es la ausencia total de ensayos, de iniciativas para encontrar cauces nuevos, soluciones nuevas. Para inventar, como marxistas, dentro del socialismo, una forma propia de abordar el surgimiento de un conflicto gravísimo entre dos Estados que han hecho la revolución socialista.

En vez de eso, el conflicto se desarrolla por los cauces más típicos de la vieja política; y así vemos cómo se buscan apoyos hasta en los Estados imperialistas. Ante esa realidad, que no cabe negar, nos preguntamos: ¿qué consideración re-

volucionaria explica que las cosas hayan por ese camino? ¿Acaso la línea oficial de China o de la URSS está interesada en ello? En modo alguno. ¿Acaso la revolución china o soviética se beneficiaría por no hablar de la revolución mundial? Basta hacer la pregunta para contestar. De hecho, es el conflicto de dos grandes potencias, de dos Estados que se oponen como tales Estados.

La raíz de esta triste realidad está sin duda en el papel predominante que desempeña hoy el Estado en los países socialistas (al menos en los más potentes), en detrimento del papel propio del partido, como tal partido: es decir, como vanguardia de la clase obrera, de las masas, como vanguardia consciente del progreso histórico, como promotor del proceso que debe llevar al paso al comunismo, a la revolución socialista mundial. Los aspectos teóricos han sido abordados en el informe del camarada Santiago Carrillo sobre el proyecto de Programa. En el conflicto entre la URSS y China ese problema se presenta de forma aguda ante todos los comunistas, ante todos los revolucionarios. A través de caminos que han sido muy diferentes, y con formas que son también hoy muy diferentes, nos encontramos sin embargo con ese fenómeno de fusión del Partido y del Estado, como instrumento de Poder. Tal deformación de la esencia del socialismo, con la limitación o supresión de la democracia socialista (al menos con respecto a las cuestiones políticas fundamentales, que son resueltas por un pequeño núcleo de dirigentes) determina que el papel y peso de la clase obrera, de las masas, se reducen, se estrechan; quedan reducidos a zonas secundarias. En cambio, el Estado, con lo que todo Estado (incluso cuando es socialista) tiene de presocialista, de residuo capitalista (como lo ha explicado Lenin con toda nitidez), va predominando, se impone. A un proceso de burocratización, en lo interior, se agregan retrocesos en las actitudes revolucionarias, en lo exterior. Hechos como la reciente elección al Buró Político del P.C.U.S. de los camaradas que son jefes de la diplomacia, del Ejército y de los servicios de seguridad, me parecen paradigmáticos. Como es preocupante la tendencia a la exaltación exclusiva del papel de una persona como dirigente del Partido y del Estado.

En ese marco surgen, en la política exterior de las grandes potencias socialistas, aspectos, y no secundarios, con los que estamos en desacuerdo, porque creemos que contrarían las exigencias de la lucha revolucionaria.

Repetimos nuestro apoyo más total a los esfuerzos de la URSS en pro de la paz y la coexistencia. Comprendemos el valor extraordinario que, para tal objetivo, tienen las conversaciones del camarada Bresnev con Nixon. Comprendemos también el que la URSS, y otros países socialistas, hagan acuerdos de cooperación comercial, económica etc. con países capitalistas, para elevar el nivel de vida de sus pueblos, acelerar su desarrollo etc.

El desacuerdo no está ahí. Surge cuando, en la realización de esa política, se acepta de hecho la perspectiva de un «statu quo» político y social en el mundo como si fuese consecuencia natural de la coexistencia pacífica; mientras, en nues-

tra opinión, y así lo formuló la Conferencia de 1969, son dos cosas completamente distintas.

En el punto tercero de los «principios» de las relaciones URSS-EE.UU., firmados por Bresnev y Nixon en mayo 1972 en Moscú, se dice que los dos países «deben hacer todo lo que esté en su poder para que no se desarrollen conflictos o situaciones que agraven las tensiones internacionales», punto que representa un paso grave, en nuestra opinión, hacia una política de «statu quo» político y social.

En un estudio de «futurología» elaborado por el camarada Inosentsev, figura destacada en la delegación soviética en la Conferencia de 1969 (estudio presentado en un coloquio en Varna, en octubre de 1972) se prevén tres hipótesis para el desarrollo de Europa occidental en el próximo período. Pero en ninguna de las tres entra la eventualidad de algún cambio de signo socialista, ni siquiera del fin del fascismo en algún país europeo; y ello cuando dicho estudio se preocupa especialmente del Mediterráneo, zona donde fija las máximas tensiones en los años futuros. O sea, que admite tres variaciones, de mayor o menor apertura en las relaciones con el Este, pero dentro de un sistema capitalista tan estable, en Occidente, como el socialismo en Oriente.

Con motivo del reciente viaje del camarada Bresnev a EE.UU., hemos podido leer en el periódico parisino «Le Monde» (del 19-VI-73) un artículo de un periodista soviético, MELOR STOUROUA, de la Agencia «NOVOSTI», del que vale la pena citar algunas frases: «Atraídos por esas perspectivas, las grandes empresas americanas, como General Electric, International Business Machine, la General Motors etc., firman contrato con las organizaciones soviéticas. Los gigantes financieros de EE.UU., como la Chasse Manhattan Bank de Rockefeller, la Bank of America, la U.S. Export Import Bank, abren sucursales en Moscú... Esos señores de la Chasse Manhattan están orgullosos de tener su oficina en Moscú en la dirección siguiente: 1, plaza Carlos Marx. ¿No es ello simbólico?

Aquí también observamos el paso de cambios cuantitativos a cambios cualitativos. En los discursos que ha pronunciado durante su visita a la República Federal de Alemania, Leonid Bresnev ha hablado de perspectivas de cooperación económica entre los países socialistas y los países capitalistas para varios decenios de años... Algunos de mis colegas, en Occidente, hablan de sustituir el «sistema de rehenes nuclear» por un sistema de rehenes económicos. A mí no me gusta la expresión «sistema de rehenes»: es de mal gusto. Pero la idea en sí misma es justa».

Este artículo expresa una tesis en esencia antisocialista: que a un determinado nivel, los acuerdos económicos con la URSS son una garantía, «con rehenes», contra el socialismo, para los máximos tiburones del capitalismo mundial. Lo grave es que esto se pueda decir, invocando frases de dirigentes del P.C.U.S. Por muy ingenuos que queramos ser, no podemos atribuir un texto semejante a las calenturas u originalidades de un periodista.

Con actitudes de este género, en las que la revolución desaparece del hori-

zonte de la política exterior de los países socialistas, junto con los otros factores a los que nos hemos referido, se llega a la siguiente contradicción: ante la crisis cada vez más evidente del imperialismo, los partidos comunistas que están en el poder, en los países más poderosos, toman actitudes defensivas que contrastan con las exigencias del combate antiimperialista. Así, comprobamos con sorpresa que los periódicos soviéticos y chinos hacen silencio sobre un caso como Watergate, ese cáncer del equipo nixoniano que descubre toda la putrefacción del imperialismo yanqui.

Cuando los principales dirigentes de esos países hablan de cuestiones internacionales, lo hacen por lo general sólo como hombres de Estado. No expresan un pensamiento combativo, de vanguardia, para la lucha mundial contra el imperialismo. Son ideas, palabras, mediatizadas casi siempre por consideraciones diplomáticas, y que no llegan a los revolucionarios. Hay un desfase enorme entre el potencial de los medios materiales, y el potencial del pensamiento revolucionario

Aunque he puesto más arriba el acento sobre una serie de aspectos negativos —que no podemos ignorar— sería unilateral, y absurdo, creer que eso es lo esencial. En el movimiento revolucionario mundial (y lo dije al principio) se han producido avances impresionantes; y maduran sin duda otros. Los progresos de la distensión representan un factor fundamental para cambiar la situación en favor de las fuerzas antiimperialistas. Se crean así condiciones más favorables para la unidad y la ofensiva de las fuerzas antiimperialistas. Y porque el marco real de hoy es así, resultan tan lamentables los factores negativos citados.

El Partido Comunista de España sigue siendo partidario —incluso si cabe hoy más que ayer— de una lucha tenaz, incansable, por la unidad de acción de todos los partidos comunistas y obreros; para lo cual es preciso utilizar todas las coyunturas que puedan surgir de unidad, de unidad de todos, aunque sean muy limitadas para empezar. Y a la vez, evitar todo lo que pueda traducirse en cristalización de divisiones, en encono de las tensiones.

En ese orden, queremos recoger aquí, apoyándonos con todas nuestras fuerzas, las palabras del camarada Le Duan, Secretario General del Partido de los Trabajadores del Vietnam, en su viaje en diversos países socialistas, en favor «del estrechamiento de la solidaridad entre los países socialistas hermanos y en el seno del movimiento comunista internacional, sobre la base del marxismo-leninismo y del internacionalismo proletario, y de manera conforme a la razón y al sentimiento.»

Es cierto que hoy el horizonte aparece cerrado. Pero estamos convencidos que, a más largo plazo, las transformaciones revolucionarias ya operadas con la liquidación de las clases explotadoras, crean la base para que sea más lo que une a los países socialistas, que no lo que les separa. Lo que les separa está enraizado en el ayer. Lo que les une, lo que les unirá, viene del mañana. Y a ello contribuirán también —de una u otra manera, no de forma automática— los cambios antiimperialistas y socialistas en otras partes del mundo.

Seguiremos poniendo de nuestra parte, modestamente, todo lo que podamos para la lucha por superar los conflictos y avanzar hacia la unidad, contra el imperialismo, de todos los Partidos Comunistas.

Hace falta trabajar con entusiasmo, con tenacidad, para realizar un Frente Mundial de todas las fuerzas antiimperialistas.

A la vez, sin esconder nuestras opiniones críticas, creemos esencial promover un debate lo más serio posible, de camaradas, dentro del marxismo, sobre los problemas de nuestro movimiento; y en particular sobre los fenómenos negativos surgidos en la plasmación histórica de nuestra teoría, y que es preciso estudiar, para poder superarlos. Ello interesa, no sólo a un partido concreto, sino a todos los partidos.

Está claro, por lo tanto, que el Partido Comunista de España, en principio, está en favor de las reuniones y discusiones, de los encuentros, de las conferencias. De todo cuanto pueda favorecer debates y elaboraciones más colectivas, la búsqueda de acciones comunes. Creemos que hoy hace falta cierta «descentralización» del proceso unitario; es decir los encuentros bilaterales, las reuniones de partidos que tienen problemas comunes y situaciones más semejantes. Pero nuestra preocupación permanente es contribuir a la unidad de todos los partidos, del movimiento en su conjunto.

Conviene detenerse sobre una propuesta que, si bien no tiene aún carácter formal, empieza a ser barajada. Se trata de un proyecto de nueva Conferencia Internacional de los Partidos Comunistas y Obreros. Un artículo del camarada Tellalov (Secretario del P.C. de Bulgaria) abogando en pro de tal Conferencia, ha sido publicado en la «Revista Internacional». Por otra parte, en la revista soviética «Autoeducación política», el camarada A. Kotlov ha publicado un artículo en el que, de forma bastante directa, preconiza una nueva Conferencia.

¿De qué forma se argumenta la idea de esta nueva Conferencia? Lo nuevo (con respecto a la del 69, que estuvo centrada en la idea de la unidad de acción de los partidos) es que ahora se insiste sobre la cohesión ideológica. Ahora bien ¿cohesión en torno a qué? Si vemos los artículos de los camaradas Tellalov y Kotlov, si examinamos algunos documentos o textos recientes de partidos de países socialistas, se observa un intento indiscutible de volver a posiciones que, en 1969, fueron explícita o implícitamente superadas.

Por ejemplo, las ideas de que «la piedra de toque del internacionalismo es la actitud hacia el PCUS», o de que el PCUS tiene «un papel de vanguardia» en nuestro movimiento, se repiten cada vez más. Incluso en Comunicados oficiales como el firmado en Berlín por los camaradas Bresnev y Honecker.

A la vez, aparece con creciente claridad el objetivo de una condena del Partido Comunista de China. Los camaradas Tellalov y Kotlov, en términos más o menos coincidentes, reclaman una cooperación de los partidos para la lucha contra el Partido Comunista Chino.

Crear que el camino para superar la

división es el de empujar los partidos a una campaña sistemática contra China es una visión completamente deformada de la realidad. Es querer servirse del movimiento comunista en un conflicto entre Estados. Eso conduce, no a la unidad, sino a agravar la división.

Una cosa es criticar a los camaradas chinos cuando se está en desacuerdo con algo que hacen. Desde luego hay motivos para ello. Y nosotros hemos condenado su conducta en las relaciones con Franco. Pero algo muy diferente sería lanzarse a una campaña de anatemas contra el P.C. chino. El Partido Comunista de España (y sabemos que lo mismo piensan otros muchos partidos) nos negamos, y nos negaremos, a embarcarnos en tal tipo de campaña antichina. Desgraciadamente, fenómenos negativos que vemos en la política del PC chino, sobre todo en su actividad internacional, no son únicos, excepcionales. Los vemos en otros casos quizá con menos justificaciones históricas.

Una Conferencia para agrupar en torno al PCUS una serie de partidos y condenar al PC chino no sería ninguna contribución a la unidad. Todo lo contrario. En 1969 (fue uno de los rasgos más positivos de dicha Conferencia) se destacó la independencia e igualdad de los partidos; se especificó que no hay «centro dirigente». Y se aceptó en la práctica el derecho de los partidos a tener su posición propia, discrepante de la del PCUS, sobre cuestiones tan importantes como la intervención en Checoslovaquia y la actitud ante el PC chino.

Una Conferencia en la actualidad tendería —como lo explica muy claramente el camarada Tellalov— a anular esos pasos positivos que se dieron el 1969. Dicho camarada acusa de «nacionalismo» a los partidos que insisten sobre su independencia. Dice que la unidad debe ser, además de política, ideológica y «orgánica». Y que se requiere «que la política de los partidos sea elaborada y coordinada colectivamente». Eso es volver a un centro. Pero ¿en qué condiciones? No es serio pensar que hoy los partidos en el Poder van a «elaborar colectivamente» su política con los otros partidos. Eso es irreal. De hecho, es una manera de abogar (y el conjunto del artículo lo confirma) por un retorno a las prácticas de la incondicionalidad con respecto al PCUS.

En esas condiciones, ponerse a preparar ahora una nueva conferencia lejos de contribuir a crear un ambiente unitario, sería hacer surgir y enconar diferencias y divisiones.

Dicho esto, reafirmamos nuestra posición de principio en favor de las Conferencias internacionales. Comprobamos cómo la idea de unidad en la diversidad, hoy esencial, avanza. Lo que crece y se abre paso, sobre todo allí donde se lucha, no es la incondicionalidad. Son las tendencias a la independencia de los partidos. Y a un internacionalismo verdadero. El ejemplo del Partido de los Trabajadores del Vietnam tiene, en ese orden, un peso y valor extraordinarios. Estamos seguros que, en un plazo más o menos largo, se crearán condiciones favorables para una Conferencia que sea un paso

hacia la unidad. La apdyaremos con entusiasmo.

Consideramos totalmente injusta la acusación de «estrechez nacionalista» que se hace a los partidos que insistimos sobre la «independencia». Esta insistencia responde precisamente a nuestro deseo de luchar, hoy, con más eficacia, por la unidad de los partidos y de todas las fuerzas antiimperialistas. Esa insistencia nos la dicta nuestro afán internacionalista, ante las realidades de un mundo, que es como es, y no como nosotros quisiéramos que fuese. Tenemos la experiencia concreta de las agresiones de que hemos sido víctimas —y que seguimos sufriendo— a través de la manipulación de Lister y Eduardo García (hoy divididos entre sí, pero que siguen recibiendo ayudas para atacarnos) y otros grupos. Y es sintomático —y no casual— que al surgir ahora este nuevo grupo fraccional en Valencia y Madrid, que toma abiertamente una bandera antisoviética, al mismo tiempo propone la unidad al grupo de Lister, y de Eduardo García, y a los llamados «prochinos» etc, con tal de reunir más fuerzas para luchar contra el Partido Comunista de España. La experiencia demuestra que hoy la opción es:

o un partido independiente como el nuestro (que por eso mismo se puede convertir en dirigente efectivo de la revolución en su propio país; y entonces puede ser realmente internacionalista);

o una serie de partiditos condenados a estar manipulados por presiones externas; en función incluso de los conflictos entre Estados socialistas. Y campo abonado para todas las degeneraciones. Inservibles para la revolución.

Debemos ver las condiciones en cierto modo contradictorias en que se presentan hoy las formas del internacionalismo proletario. De un lado, tenemos una necesidad objetiva fundamental de elevar el internacionalismo a un nivel superior, en función de los propios cambios históricos. El carácter internacional de la clase obrera es hoy más claro, más fuerte, que en el pasado. El fenómeno de las empresas multinacionales lo refuerza aún. El entrelazamiento entre las diferentes luchas, en los diversos países, contra el imperialismo, resalta más que nunca. El ejemplo del movimiento de solidaridad con el Vietnam es elocuente.

Pero, en la etapa actual, con 14 Estados socialistas, y con un agudo conflicto entre ellos, las formas del internacionalismo tienen que tomar sus distancias con respecto a los problemas de Estado.

Tomar esas distancias, no para romper. Precisamente lo contrario. **Para no romper.** Para que los partidos comunistas, el movimiento comunista, pueda desempeñar un papel en el sentido de superar divisiones, de contribuir a la unidad de todas las fuerzas socialistas y antiimperialistas a escala mundial.

Sin duda, se trata de una situación pasajera. Cuando el socialismo llegue a un nivel superior de su maduración histórica, cuando se aleje, se separe más radicalmente de los residuos capitalistas que aún le lastran, el internacionalismo podrá tomar formas muy superiores; que hoy son imposibles.

En cuanto al avance del internaciona-

lismo —en cuestiones y puntos claves del combate contra el imperialismo y el capitalismo— podemos presentar hoy hechos y perspectivas muy positivas, y de enorme alcance.

Recordemos con qué fuerza planteaba el camarada Santiago Carrillo, en su informe ante nuestro Comité Central de septiembre del '70, la necesidad de estrechar las relaciones entre los PP.CC. de Europa Occidental para «coordinar la lucha de clases a escala europea en todos aquellos aspectos que la realidad de hoy nos impone». De establecer contactos entre los partidos comunistas, los partidos socialistas, los sindicatos, los grupos cristianos y católicos y otros, para una acción común a escala del continente.

«Si no hubiera otras causas —decía Carrillo en 1970— ya la tendencia de los monopolios europeos y los pasos concretos realizados por éstos plantearía a las masas trabajadoras de Europa, y en primer lugar a los Partidos Comunistas, la necesidad de elaborar una estrategia común frente a la situación que nos crea el desarrollo capitalista europeo... «Se trata de oponer, de dar coherencia, frente a los proyectos de los monopolios, a la perspectiva de una Europa democrática y socialista».

En este sentido hemos trabajado con intensidad. Primero en nuestras relaciones con los partidos comunistas de Europa. A la vez, estableciendo contactos con diversos partidos socialistas, contactos con los que creemos haber contribuido a la actitud más combativa que la socialdemocracia europea adopta hoy frente al franquismo. A diversos niveles, hemos tenido conversaciones con los partidos socialistas de Gran Bretaña, Francia, Italia, Suecia, Bélgica etc.

Paralelamente, en los partidos comunistas más influyentes de Europa Occidental, han madurado concepciones semejantes. Queremos destacar la importancia de primer plano que ha tenido la entrevista Marchais-Berlinguer y el comunicado de los partidos comunistas de Italia y Francia; seguido, en los últimos meses, de una serie de otros comunicados entre partidos europeos, coincidentes sobre la necesidad de una colaboración más estrecha. Estamos entrando en una nueva etapa del movimiento comunista de Europa Occidental, con la perspectiva concreta de acciones articuladas de los partidos comunistas sobre problemas decisivos. Por ejemplo:

Lucha contra los regímenes fascistas. A la vez, contra las tendencias autoritarias, contra el neofascismo. Por la defensa y desarrollo de la democracia.

Coordinación de la lucha de clases contra los monopolios multinacionales. Defensa de los obreros inmigrados.

Lucha por un sistema de seguridad europea, contra las bases militares extranjeras, por el desarme, por la supresión de los bloques.

Lucha contra el colonialismo y el neocolonialismo. Solidaridad con las luchas antiimperialistas (Indochina, Cuba, Corea, Chile, pueblos árabes etc.).

Sobre estos problemas, y sobre otros, surgen además posibilidades unitarias

juventudes, con extensas fuerzas cristianas, y en el movimiento sindical.

La creación de la nueva Central Sindical Europea (aunque en ella tengan hoy predominio los reformistas), representa un paso importante que puede favorecer el proceso unitario. Nuestra opinión es que los movimientos sindicales revolucionarios de Europa Occidental, ingresando en esa Central, encontrarán posibilidades de lucha unida de los trabajadores muy superiores a las que hoy existen. Sin duda ello plantea problemas. Pero hace falta resolverlos con la mira puesta en la lucha unida. CC.OO. deberá tomar posición sobre esta cuestión. Una tarea esencial para los partidos comunistas de Europa Occidental es elaborar conjuntamente una «imagen de marca» de lo que el socialismo puede y debe ser en esta parte del mundo. Nuestra mayor aportación a tal tarea será el «Proyecto de Programa». No entro por ello en el tema. Sólo insisto en que, si esa imagen de un socialismo adecuado a nuestras sociedades de Europa Occidental, es presentada conjuntamente por los partidos comunistas de la Europa capitalista, eso nos da, y nos dará una fuerza mucho mayor.

Huelga decir que una mayor articulación de los partidos de los países capitalistas, lejos de ser una merma, permitirá una contribución más efectiva a la unidad del conjunto del movimiento, que sigue siendo nuestra meta esencial. En primer término, para reforzar las relaciones con los partidos de los países socialistas. Asimismo, con partidos no europeos, pero que tienen problemas muy semejantes (y pienso sobre todo en el P.C. Japonés, en el de Australia, Canadá, EE.UU...)

Una cuestión esencial es elevar la solidaridad, la unidad internacionalista del proletariado europeo con los movimientos de liberación nacional, con las luchas de los pueblos de Asia, de América Latina, de África. Concretamente con los pueblos árabes (especialmente el pueblo palestino) que siguen sometidos a la criminal política agresiva de los dirigentes de Israel, apoyados por EE.UU.

A nosotros, como Partido, se nos plantea la necesidad de una lucha más resuelta contra la política colonialista del franquismo en África. Nuestras posiciones son muy claras. Debemos reconocer de forma autocrítica, que no hacemos lo bastante para propugnarlas. La entrevista que hemos celebrado con el Partido de la Liberación y del Socialismo de Marruecos ha sido un paso positivo en ese terreno.

Es pues evidente que la etapa más dinámica en que vamos a entrar en cuanto a las relaciones entre los PP.CC. de Europa Occidental —respondiendo a las exigencias de la lucha de clases en esta parte del mundo— será una ayuda para la unidad del conjunto del movimiento comunista y de todas las fuerzas antiimperialistas.

28 Feb 74

U S S R I N T E R N A T I O N A L A F F A I R S

GENERAL

PARTY JOURNAL ATTACK ON AZCARATE STRESSES COEXISTENCE POLICY

Moscow in Spanish to Spain 2130 GMT 16 Feb 74 L

[Article published in "latest" issue of the CPSU Central Committee journal PARTIYNAYA ZHIZHN: "On an Article by Manuel Azcarate, a Leader of the Spanish Communist Party". During the period 14 though 19 February, texts of the article were also broadcast to Germany in German, Italy in Italian, and Portugal in Portuguese. Summaries were broadcast in English to South East Asia, French to France, German to Germany, German to Austria, Italian to Italy, Spanish to Spain, Spanish to Central America, Swedish to Sweden, Greek to Greece, Japanese to Japan, Korean to Korea, Mongolian to Mongolia, Polish to Poland, Czech to Czechoslovakia, Romanian to Romania, and Hungarian to Hungary.]

[Text] Questions of the socialist countries' foreign policies, their interaction with the international class struggle, and the interdependence between peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and the recently achieved international detente on the one hand, and the development of the liberation struggle in any given part of the world on the other, are drawing the attention of the communist movement.

Stands on these matters have been expressed more than once in documents jointly drawn up by the fraternal parties: as, for example, the documents adopted at the international conferences held in 1957, 1960 and 1969 which provide perfectly clear and unequivocal answers. These problems are also analyzed in detail in documents of many of the communist and workers parties of the countries of the socialist community and in documents of the communist parties of France, Italy, Germany, United States, India and others.

The said documents show that the communist and workers parties, firm in their Marxist-Leninist stand, adopt a common approach to these extremely important issues which play an extraordinary role not only with regard to the theoretical activity of the mentioned parties but also as regards their practical work and their daily struggle for the workers' interests, for peace, democracy and socialism.

Contrary to these stands, Comrade Manuel Azcarate, member of the Executive Committee and of the secretariat of the Central Committee of the Spanish Communist Party, holds a different viewpoint. Issue No 72 for the fourth quarter of 1973 of the Spanish Communist Party's theoretical review NUESTRA BANDERA carries a shortened version of his report to the session of his party's Central Committee held in September of the same year. This report analyzes a number of issues including those concerning the struggle of the democratic forces in Spain. It puts forward suggestions regarding the foreign policy to be implemented by the Spanish opposition. Most of the report is an analysis of the recent changes in the international arena and arrives at the conclusion that the crisis of imperialism is continuing to intensify while the successes of the revolutionary forces are increasing.

However, in his analysis of several important current developments concerning the above-mentioned issues, Comrade Azcarate sets forth a number of incorrect concepts. The first aspect, which Azcarate touches upon several times in his report, is that of the role of the world socialist community in the world of today, above all its part in international politics.

In its documents, the communist movement has clearly defined the role of world socialism. It has pointed out that since world socialism is the main consequence of the international workers movement, it represents a decisive force in the anti-imperialist struggle. This is logical because the rise of the socialist system is a new stage in the development of the international class struggle, in the development of the entire world revolutionary process.

With the appearance of the socialist system, the dictatorship of the proletariat expanded beyond the borders of a single country, and the whole international working class was equipped with a new revolutionary weapon of enormous strength to bring about changes. Imperialism, one could say, was caught in the two-pronged grip of world socialism on the one hand, and of the working movement striving for independence in countries still under the rule of capital on the other.

The interests of world socialism and the interests of other detachments of the world revolutionary movement in capitalist countries are identical. They fight to completely liberate working mankind from the capitalist yoke, to bring all the peoples to the road of a socialist, free and independent development. The identity of interests between the socialist countries, the international workers movement and the national liberation movement stems from the very nature of the socialist system and of the working class. This identity of interests manifests itself in the united action of all the anti-imperialist forces which is being carried out in practice in the international arena.

Let it be said in passing that there were times when the Spanish Communist Party had no objections to stating in a communique on its meeting with a delegation of the CPSU, among other things, the following: It is now more important than ever to go on strengthening the cohesion of and cooperation among the socialist countries, the communist and workers movements, and all the anti-imperialist forces as well as to continue defending and developing the positions of socialism.

Naturally, fighting for what are after all the same goals, each revolutionary force operates under different conditions. Workers of the socialist countries contribute to the revolutionary process first of all by building a new society, a society where everything is placed above capitalism, because it represents the consistent implementation of the main economic and social tasks facing mankind. The building of a new society provides an understandable and attractive example for workers in any country. It is the example of how to solve problems which have worried people for centuries and which capitalism never managed to solve even in the most developed countries.

The international policy of the countries of the socialist community is aimed at bringing about the ideal conditions for the construction of socialism and communism, at supporting the people's liberation struggle, at protecting peace and safeguarding peaceful coexistence, that is to say, at protecting the very existence of life on our planet. Thus, these countries bring an important contribution to the world's revolutionary change.

From the above considerations it is clear that the interests of the peoples engaged in the construction of socialism, far from being opposed to the interests of other detachments of the revolutionary movement, coincide with them. Our entire movement's aspiration is to achieve the irreversible strengthening of the power of the socialist countries and to consolidate the positions of world socialism. Our whole movement's aspiration is to turn the world balance of forces in favor of social progress and peace so that the forces of war may be checked and the peoples may finally achieve free self-determination without imperialist interference.

It seems odd, to say the least, that Azcarate should absolutely disregard the important contribution of the countries of the socialist community in the tasks of liquidating U.S. imperialist aggression in Vietnam, in checking the Israeli aggressors and supporting the Arab people's struggle, as well as their support for the workers and national liberation movement in Spain itself.

In his report Azcarate sharply distorts the essence of the foreign policy followed by the USSR and other socialist countries and the international activity of the CPSU.
[paragraph continues]

28 Feb 74

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
GENERAL

He sets forth the false thesis that there are contradictions between the state interests of the socialist countries and the interests of the revolutionary movement. He says, for example, that when the leaders of the socialist countries' communist parties talk on international affairs, they do it, as a rule, merely in the capacity of statesmen, and that their pronouncements, nearly always dictated by diplomatic considerations, supposedly are not addressed to the revolutionaries. Elsewhere in his report Azcarate advises keeping the problems of internationalism apart from state problems. In saying this Azcarate sees deliberately or otherwise the state interests of the socialist countries as being in conflict with the interests of the revolutionary movement, the interests of fraternal parties.

It is clear that such views are radically in contradiction with the principles of socialism and with the revolutionary struggle in its current form. Azcarate claims to give his all-out support to the efforts of the USSR and other socialist countries in the cause of peace. He claims to support the policy of peaceful coexistence proclaimed and implemented by the said countries, but at the same time he raises a whole series of objections which show that he is against the aforementioned policy.

Azcarate's main objection to the policy of peaceful coexistence is that the practical implementation of this policy by the socialist countries--and above all by the Soviet Union--supposedly leads to the stagnation of the world politico-social status quo, and that the socialist countries take a defensive stance in the anti-imperialist struggle. Contradicting the truth, he says the socialist countries are to a certain extent abandoning the revolutionary stand in their foreign policy. According to Azcarate's forecast--which distorts facts known to everyone--the world is facing the prospects of a politico-social status quo which is the result of the policy of peaceful coexistence followed by the socialist community. Any conscientious member of the workers movement will realize how incorrect and absurd such statements are.

In its documents, the international communist movement has more than once qualified the policy of peaceful coexistence. It has underlined that peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems is a form of class struggle. It has noted the fact that, relying on its always growing economic and military might, the world socialist system hinders imperialism and restricts its possibilities of exporting counterrevolution. It has pointed out that the policy of peaceful coexistence helps find positive solutions to the economic and social problems of developing countries. It has also pointed out that the said policy does not clash with the oppressed people's right to fight for their liberation following whichever method they consider necessary--armed or nonarmed struggle. It has also pointed out that the policy of peaceful coexistence hinders the efforts of imperialism to overcome its internal contradictions by increasing world tension and creating hotbeds of war. This policy does not imply either the preservation of the social and political status quo or the weakening of the ideological struggle. On the contrary, it helps give impetus to the class struggle against imperialism at the national and world level.

Such is the communists' firm position endorsed by the main document of the 1969 conference, a document which was also approved by the Spanish Communist Party. In its issue No 21, 1968, the periodical MUNDO OBRERO, organ of the Spanish Communist Party, wrote that the Spanish communists held the view that the defense of the policy of peaceful coexistence should be combined with the extension and intensification of the class struggle in countries still under capitalism. It is obvious that the view held by the international communist movement and by the Spanish Communist Party itself, a principled view, differs from that now held by Azcarate with regard to the policy of peaceful coexistence.

Developments in recent years have led to substantial changes in the international arena. Azcarate himself will find it difficult to deny that those changes are, to a very great extent, a consequence of the consistent implementation of the foreign policy of the socialist countries, first of all of the Soviet Union. This is a fact that even our class enemies accept. The tasks confronting the socialist countries are carried out in close cooperation with the communist and workers parties, with the national liberation movements.

As a result of the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people, and thanks to the firm support they received from the Soviet Union and other socialist parties as well as from the communist and workers parties and the whole liberation and revolutionary movement, the imperialist aggression in Indochina was answered. The Vietnamese people have been given a real possibility of deciding how the future development of their country will be carried out. Is this not in the interest of the liberation struggle of peoples in the world in general?

Azcarate himself is forced to admit that it is unquestionably so. The victory of the Vietnamese people was one of the greatly important developments in international life, in the revolutionary struggle of peoples.

Here is another example: The military conflict which started in southern Asia was quickly solved. A very important role was played by the policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, which supported the just demands of the Bangladesh people and the position of the Republic of India. Now a real possibility to establish lasting peace exists on the Indian subcontinent. Is this not in the interest of people's liberation struggle? Progressive forces in India, Bangladesh and Pakistan hold the view that it is unquestionably so. The recent positive changes in the domestic life of the countries concerned confirm that under conditions of peace it is much easier to achieve progressive social and economic changes.

The fourth war in the Middle East, which started as a result of the actions of imperialist forces, and first of all of Israel's forces of aggression, has been cut short. For the first time, an agreement on troop disengagement has been signed. Of course this is only a first step. The Soviet Union has worked and will continue to work for a total political settlement in the Middle East, for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all the occupied Arab territories, for the reestablishment of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. It is difficult to see how anyone could find grounds to claim that all this is opposed to the interests of the liberation movements. On the contrary, a peaceful settlement in the Middle East would be in the interest of the Arab people's struggle and would help to give form to progressive social and economic changes in that part of the world.

Substantial changes have taken place lately on the European continent. Through the coordinated policy of the socialist countries, of communist and workers parties and of the democratic movement as a whole, the aims pursued by the communist movement for a quarter of a century have been achieved to a great extent. These aims were specifically endorsed during the conference of communist parties held in Karlovy Vary, as well as in the documents of the Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of 1969. The results of World War II and the developments of the postwar years in Europe have been endorsed. The existing borders have been recognized and the principle of the non-use of force has been endorsed. All this means that the gains of socialism have been accepted, and above all that the existence of the socialist German Democratic Republic, the first workers and peasants state on German soil, has been recognized. Is this not in the interest of the liberation struggle in general? In the unanimous view of European communist parties, these changes are undeniably favorable to the cause of socialism and peace.

Azcarate looks with special thoroughness into the situation in capitalist Europe, voices his own forecasts on its development prospects and puts forward his own European alternative, trying to impose it on all the communist parties of the European capitalist countries. But this alternative of his reeks of nationalism. Azcarate would like to see a democratic and socialist Europe but with no ties whatever with the present socialist community.

In recent times there has been a change in the atmosphere of Soviet-American relations. Azcarate cannot deny the importance of the talks between Comrade Brezhnev and President Nixon. Indeed, the Soviet-American agreements have had a very substantial influence on the general improvement of international relations. The said agreements are an important step toward avoiding in the future situations which may threaten world peace. Can this be against the interests of the revolutionary movement? Can it be that the revolutionaries are interested in fostering international tension which carries the danger of another world war?

In the 1969 conference, the world communist and workers parties stated that the main link in the united action of the anti-imperialist forces remains the struggle against the danger of thermonuclear war. The Spanish Communist Party has repeatedly voiced support for this stand. It is clear that any steps taken by the Soviet state in its relations with the United States serves this same objective.

It is unarguable that the recent changes in the international arena have the overall significance of remarkably strengthening the positions of the forces of peace and socialism and of weakening the most aggressive and bellicose imperialist forces whose hopes were pinned, and continue to be, on war. One thing therefore is clear: The policy of the socialist countries is one of offensive against imperialism and by no means the defensive stance Azcarate would have us to believe.

Naturally, the socialist countries, the workers movement in capitalist countries and the anti-imperialist struggle in the former colonies follow different methods of struggle. Socialism develops its peaceful offensive resorting to methods of foreign policy, to diplomacy as well as international political support for forces fighting for their national and social liberation. In capitalist countries, the working class has its own ways of fighting imperialism. Countries born in the blaze of the national liberation struggle also resort to other methods inherent to these countries in their anti-imperialist struggle. In the final analysis all these actions pursue the same goal and all the revolutionary forces of present times coordinate their action to achieve the best results. This very unity of the anti-imperialist forces was seen by the 1969 conference as a guarantee for the success of the struggle against imperialism.

Admittedly, not all the problems of international life have been solved. There are still points of tension. Guns have not gone silent everywhere in the world. The armaments race, which is in fact a process of material preparation for war, is going on. But it would be wrong to close one's eyes to the fact that there has been a noticeable change in the basic trend, and this change is precisely the result of the active struggle of socialist countries and of all the revolutionary forces. Further changes in favor of detente can only be achieved through struggle, a fierce, determined and consistent struggle.

As far as the socialist countries, first and foremost the USSR, are concerned; they are continuing to step up their policy aimed at resolving the problems that remain. They coordinate their efforts with those of the workers movement, of the national liberation movement, and of the fraternal communist and workers movement.

In spite of all these facts, Azcarate declares in his report that the policy of peaceful coexistence leads in practice to the political and social status quo and that the revolution is vanishing from the horizon of the socialist countries' foreign policy. According to Azcarate, the policy of the socialist countries is an obstacle to the development of the people's revolutionary struggle and, still according to him, the policy of peaceful coexistence and detente hamper the anti-imperialist struggle and the revolutionary change of the world, Spain included. Such a conclusion is absolutely in contradiction with the real state of affairs and with the stands of the fraternal communist parties..

One may well recall that during the cold war and the days of international tension the conditions under which the class struggles took place in capitalist countries were very unfavorable. They were so because the danger of war and the tension enabled the most reactionary political forces to come to the fore and to intensify their pressure on the working masses, to exert greater pressure, to suppress democratic freedoms as well as to unleash reprisals against the working class and against the national liberation movement. International tension helped reactionary regimes to get a firm hold in a number of countries, Spain and Portugal included. All this was discussed at length in documents of the Spanish Communist Party itself. But as proved by practice--which in Lenin's words is the best criteria for judging the truth--detente creates a far better atmosphere in which to fight for democratic freedoms, for a reduction of military expenditures, for the improvement of the material situation of the masses, and for democratic and social changes.

Detente brings about new and more favorable premises to intensify the struggle for the unity of all antimonopolistic forces. For instance, it was not by mere chance that the agreement on a joint government program of the French Communist Party and socialist party was achieved in a climate of development of relations between the Soviet and French states, when peaceful coexistence is becoming more firmly established. The resolution issued by the 20th Congress of the French Communist Party held in December 1972, specifically says peaceful coexistence between states of different social systems creates conditions which are more favorable to the struggle of peoples for their independence, to the struggle of the working class and its aspirations to democracy and socialism. Georges Marchais, secretary general of the French Communist Party, who presented to the congress the report on activities, said any advance in the sphere of peaceful coexistence helps to curtail the chances of interference on the part of imperialism, helps to isolate the most reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie, to reduce anticommunism and prejudices against socialism, and to expand the front of democratic and social struggle.

As regards the Communist Party of the United States, we can say that hailing Leonid Brezhnev's visit to the United States, the secretary general of the CPUSA, Gus Hall, and the party's national chairman Henry Winston, in a letter to Leonid Brezhnev, which was published in the DAILY WORLD of 19 June 1973, said: Every step aimed at establishing control over world stock of nuclear weapons and to neutralize them is in the vital interest of every inhabitant of the planet. The reinforcement of peace serves the cause of progress, strengthens the anti-imperialist forces and is vitally important to the interests of those who fight for national independence.

It is obvious that under the conditions of detente, a number of problems arise for the revolutionary forces and for the communist parties. The most important one is the problem of how to use best and most effectively the new conditions created when peace is strengthened. The fraternal countries are working on the solution of the problem. The documents of congresses recently held by communists in France, Britain, West Germany, Belgium, Sweden, Norway and Austria bear witness to this fact. As communists have repeatedly said, it is absolutely clear that the questions concerning the development of the class struggle and the system to be established in any given country are, first and foremost, matters to be solved by the peoples of that country and their revolutionary vanguard--the communist and workers parties.

Azcarate's invectives against the Soviet socialist system cannot pass without comment. While in the USSR's developed socialist society Soviet democracy blooms and there is an ever-increasing heightening of the creative activity of the working masses in every sphere of social life, Azcarate, siding with the declared enemies of the Soviet socialist system, takes the liberty of spreading all manner of lies about the absence of democracy in the USSR.

A considerable part of Azcarate's report is devoted to the problems of the world communist movement. The process of consolidating the communist ranks is being successfully developed. This process was particularly helped by the international conference of 1969. The program of struggle drafted by the conference became, in fact, a program of activity applied by the absolute majority of communist and workers' parties. As communists worked to apply that program their cohesion also grew. Their cooperation on the political and ideological spheres has been intensified. The process of consolidating the unity of communists all over the world naturally is taking place through bilateral and multilateral meetings between fraternal parties. A special contribution to this process was made by the meeting of top leaders of fraternal socialist countries held in Crimea and by the recently-held meeting of leaders of communist parties from Arab countries. A prominent role was played by the conference of communist and workers' parties from capitalist countries of Europe held in Brussels in January 1974. At the congresses of many fraternal parties held in recent times, the communists unanimously underlined the importance of greater cooperation between fraternal countries on concrete problems. They came out in favor of developing contacts and cooperation between parties in various spheres. Finally, they noted that at a certain stage the question may arise of holding a new international conference.

It should be remembered that communists have repeatedly stressed the usefulness of international conferences. For instance, the unanimously adopted communique of the 1969 conference says: Participants to the conference have expressed their readiness to continue developing contacts between the communist and workers' parties; they have reaffirmed the advisability of bilateral and regional meetings, the advisability, whenever circumstances make it necessary, of holding international conferences of communist and workers parties to exchange views and experiences, to collectively discuss and solve the political and theoretical problems of the moment, the problems of the anti-imperialist struggle, for the triumph of peace, national independence, democracy and socialism. Speaking of a possible new conference as though it were a fait accompli--despite the fact that so far the need for such a conference is advocated only by a number of parties--Azcarate states categorically, without giving any reasonable and well-founded explanation, that under the present circumstances no conference could contribute to consolidating the unity of the communist movement.

One cannot but note that Azcarate is launching a crude attack against the Soviet Union. He claims that the CPSU supposedly is taking no steps, making no attempts, taking no initiatives to overcome the tension in the relations between the USSR and China. Instead of objectively and truthfully noting the stance of the CPSU and Soviet Government on this issue, Azcarate emphasizes and repeats the Chinese lies about an imaginary encirclement and Soviet military pressure on China. However, the whole world is aware that the CPSU consistently and perseveringly strives to achieve a normalization of the relations between the USSR and China, and that the CPSU has put forward--and is continuing to put forward--constructive proposals which are rejected by the Chinese leadership one after the other. Azcarate is purely and simply lying and doing a favor to the anti-Leninist and anti-Soviet position of the Chinese leadership when he holds the USSR and the CPSU responsible for the continuing tension in relations between the USSR and China.

While categorically rejecting any attempts to export counterrevolution, Marxism-Leninism is also against exporting revolution. However, when the people of any given country rise in the struggle for freedom and social progress, they can rely on the support of the socialist world. Life itself has provided repeated examples of this.

As is states in the document of the 1969 conference, every liberation struggle has the irreplaceable support of the socialist world, and first and foremost the Soviet Union.

It is worth mentioning that there was time when that same view was shared by the review NUESTRA BANDERA, which wrote in June 1968 that the Soviet Union and the CPSU had been able to carry out a sensible policy of support for the struggling people. The Spanish Communist Party had particular reasons for saying so, specifically taking into account the assistance given by the Soviet Union to the Republican government during the 1936-39 national revolutionary war in Spain. Dolores Ibarruri, chairman of the Spanish Communist Party, wrote in this connection that the Soviet Union--at the time the world's only socialist state--despite the geographical distance separating it from the theater of events, which made it nearly impossible to physically help the Spanish people, proclaimed from the very beginning that the struggle of the Spanish people was the cause of all enlightened and progressive mankind.

The Soviet Union proved with deeds that this statement was not mere propaganda. Despite the complex situation faced by the Soviet Union--which at the time was preparing to oppose the impending Hitlerite aggression--it sent military equipment, planes, tanks and weapons as well as military specialists to Spain. The same policy of fraternal solidarity was followed by the socialist countries, which have truly internationalist stands.

Only the policy of the present Chinese leadership, which consistently supported the anti-communist forces during the events in the Sudan, came out with actions against the liberation struggle of the Bangladesh people and in support of the fascist Junta in Chile, and with total disregard for the Spanish Communist Party established diplomatic relations with the antipopular Franco regime, totally deviates from this line.

Azcarate is particularly critical of the economic relations existing between capitalist and socialist countries. He takes the view that when the socialist countries talk of long-term cooperation with any country of the opposing system this supposedly precludes the possibility of any social changes in the said country. He went so far as to speak favorably about the theory of a system of economic hostages to replace the system of nuclear hostages, a theory put forward by bourgeois propaganda. It is hardly necessary to prove the total inconsistency of such an assertion.

Either we accept the principle that communists are in favor of solving conflicts between the two systems on an international scale without nuclear war, or else we favor exporting revolution even by military means. If we accept the first premise we must accept the prospects of developing peaceful relations between countries, including economic relations. The development of economic relations between the socialist system and capitalist countries is perfectly consistent with the overall policy of struggle against the aggressive forces of imperialism, because economic relations mean, in fact, the development of peaceful contacts and support for the realistic members of the capitalist world. One might also add that the workers of the capitalist countries see in the development of economic relations with the socialist world an important antidote to the ever-increasing unemployment of the capitalist world, unemployment from current developments which add up to crisis.

One of Azcarate's main arguments against a possible new international conference is the allegation that it might lead to going back to the practice of unconditional acceptance of the CPSU line [retorno a las practicas de la incondicionalidad con respecto al pous], to the creation of a single organizational center for the communist movement. He even says that some people are determined to create that kind of center. As far as the CPSU is concerned, even at the 21st Congress the CPSU stated that our party, educated by Lenin in the spirit of proletarian internationalism, sees itself as a detachment of the international workers' and communist movement. The CPSU has often emphasized that there is not, and cannot be, any single center of the international communist movement, that there are no leader parties and no ruled parties in the international communist movement. It is its basic assumption that all the parties are independent and enjoy equal rights, and CPSU policy is based on that principle.

In trying to frighten himself and others with the mythical possibility of the creation of a new single organizational center of the communist movement, Azcarate is in fact pursuing a different goal. As can be gathered from his report, he is against the communist parties' jointly debating at international meetings problems of the strategy and tactics of the anti-imperialist struggle, against them drawing agreed conclusions on those questions, because he sees in this a threat to the independence and autonomy of fraternal parties. The founders of Marxism-Leninism, when speaking about the independence of communists, held the view that above all one must speak about their independence from class enemies, from opportunists and revisionists of all hues. In other words, for communists independence means, above all, their class stance. A true class stance can be nothing but truly internationalist. This is precisely why the independence and autonomy of Marxist-Leninist parties--and this view has always been held by the communists, starting with Marx, Engels and Lenin--is expressed in their independently-drawn policies directed toward defending the interests of each detachment of the working class, toward protecting at the same time the general interests of the class struggle of the proletariat on an international scale, and toward developing to the utmost cooperation between communists the world over.

The 1969 international conference also presented clearly and plainly its views on that question, and let us add that it put forward a single program of action. This programme has been carried out, in the past and at present, and it favors positive changes in the international situation as a whole.

Therefore, the way in which Azcarate approaches the problems of autonomy and equality of rights of the fraternal parties includes not one ounce of proletarian internationalism or one drop of concern for the revolutionary struggle, to increase its effectiveness for solidarity and mutual support.

In this context another part of the report is also characteristic: Azcarate, without any false modesty, proposes to the communist movement the choice between two types of communist parties: one party like ours or a number of puny little parties doomed to be controlled by external pressures arising even from the conflicts among socialist states. When he attacks without grounds the other fraternal parties, Azcarate denigrates his struggle companions in other countries and offers them a new personal criterion of independence and internationalism. It happens that this criterion is independence in respect to conflicts among socialist states. This formula hides the recipe for an absolute forgiveness of the policy of the Chinese leadership, the recipe for the maintenance of equal distances between two ideopolitical questions: on one hand the vast majority of the fraternal parties and on the other hand the Chinese Communist Party. Can such recommendations be regarded as being principled? In our view, absolutely not.

The CPSU and the Spanish Communist Party have always been united by close and friendly ties, ties of common struggle for the workers' interests, against fascism and war. They are united by the blood of their sons shed at the fronts of the Spanish civil war and of the Great Patriotic War. Today, as in the past, the CPSU firmly upholds the line of supporting the struggle of the communists and of all the workers of Spain against the antipopular regime, for democracy, social justice and peace.

In words Azcarate may give the impression of being in favor of improving and developing relations between our parties. But friendship is something mutual which must be backed by facts. Words alone are not enough. In the relations between parties from different countries, it is not enough that only one of them should have good relations and support the other. There must be mutual understanding and good feelings of comradeship. Azcarate's speech in no way proves that he upholds that view. If we look at his speech from the angle of relations between our two parties, the only thing that can be said is that it in no way helps strengthen these relations. In fact Azcarate questions the principled line followed by the CPSU in international relations and in the communist movement. Although his report repeatedly refers to the generally accepted principles of mutual relations between parties, as far as he is concerned he rejects those principles and goes to the extreme of grossly interfering in the domestic affairs of our party and suggests candidates to be elected in leading bodies of the CPSU.

Unless Azcarate's statements are a mistake, a question is likely to arise: Is his speech a premeditated attempt to worsen relations between the CPSU and the Spanish Communist Party? In any event--and this can be said firmly--that type of statements does not contribute to strengthening friendship or to developing normal relations between the Spanish Communist Party and other communist parties, in particular those against whom the slanders contained in Azcarate's report are directed.

As far as our party is concerned, today as before it is certain that at the present time the communist movement must close its ranks and intensify joint efforts in joint struggle. The CPSU has always strived and will always strive to develop and strengthen its relations with the Spanish Communist Party on the basis of principled positions, on positions of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.